

EXACT FORMFACTORS IN THE ONE-LOOP CURVED-SPACE QED
AND THE NONLOCAL MULTIPLICATIVE ANOMALYBruno Gonçalves¹, Guilherme de Berredo-Peixoto², Ilya L. Shapiro³*Departamento de Física, ICE, Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Juiz de Fora, CEP: 36036-330, MG, Brazil***Abstract**

The well-known formula $\det(A \cdot B) = \det A \cdot \det B$ can be easily proved for finite dimensional matrices but it may be incorrect for the functional determinants of differential operators, including the ones which are relevant for Quantum Field Theory applications. Considerable work has been done to prove that this equality can be violated, but in all previously known cases the difference could be reduced to renormalization ambiguity. We present the first example, where the difference between the two functional determinants is a *nonlocal* expression and therefore can not be explained by the renormalization ambiguity. Moreover, through the use of other even dimensions we explain the origin of this difference at qualitative level.

Pacs: 04.62.+v; 11.15.Kc; 11.10.Kk; 12.20.Ds**Keywords:** Multiplicative anomaly, QED, Formfactors.**1 Introduction**

The one-loop calculations have a prominent role in Quantum Field Theory (QFT) and in many of its most relevant applications. In the background field method the one-loop contributions can be always reduced to the derivation of $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}$ of the operator $\hat{H}$, which is typically a bilinear form of the classical action with respect to the quantum fields. The operator $\hat{H}$ usually depends on the background fields (which may be just external fields). As a result the operation of taking the functional determinant of such an operator is mathematically nontrivial due to the infinite dimension of the corresponding matrix representation. In particular, relations such as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Det } (\hat{A} \cdot \hat{B}) &= \text{Det } \hat{A} \cdot \text{Det } \hat{B} \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Ln Det } \hat{A} &= \text{Tr Ln } \hat{A}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

which are certainly valid for the finite dimensional matrices should be, in principle, proved or taken by faith in QFT. There is indeed another possibility that these relations can be *disproved* and, according to mathematical logic, this can be done by means of at least one single nontrivial

¹brunoxgoncalves@yahoo.com.br²guilherme@fisica.ufjf.br³Also at Tomsk State Pedagogical University, Russia, shapiro@fisica.ufjf.br

counterexample. For instance, that could mean a couple of operators, $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$, for which the first relation in (1) would be violated. Such a situation was called *multiplicative anomaly* (MA) [1, 2].

Considerable efforts have been applied to find an example where the first equality (1) would be violated, but until now in all cases the difference was likely caused by the renormalization ambiguity only [3, 4, 5]. This means that when one imposes the renormalization conditions to the three operators $\hat{A}$, $\hat{B}$ and $\hat{A} \cdot \hat{B}$, there may be a difference due to the independence of these renormalization conditions for the distinct operators. In particular, such a situation can take place when the functional determinants are defined by means of the generalized ζ -function [6], because this approach “hides” the divergences and provides the regularized and renormalized result automatically. Then the μ -dependence should be implemented artificially and this opens the way for the MA. The example of such a situation has been analyzed in detail in [7, 3]. If we consider, for example, the $\text{Ln Det} (\square + M_1^2) \cdot (\square + M_2^2)$ on de Sitter background, the result will be a functional which depends on some constant parameters, namely on $M_{1,2}^2$ and on the scalar curvature Λ . Furthermore, this expression has dimension four. As a result it has exactly the same structure as the counterterms and, therefore, it is a subject of the renormalization ambiguity. Thus, it is very difficult to make positive conclusion on the existence of the MA based on such calculations. In order to establish the existence of the MA one needs to find it in such a finite sector of the effective action which can be clearly different from the counterterms.

The purpose of the present letter is to present an example of another sort, that means the *nonlocal* MA which is not reduced to the renormalization ambiguity. In order to construct such example we consider one of the most familiar theories, that is the usual spinor QED. We consider a curved space-time, but the effect can be observed even in flat space-time. This letter represents a short communication devoted to the MA and we leave technical details to the parallel publication [8], devoted to the general investigation of quantum violation of conformal invariance for electromagnetic fields.

2 Photon formfactors in the 1-loop QED

Consider the problem of deriving the correction to the electromagnetic field propagation from the single loop of a Dirac fermion. The Euclidean action has the form

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{g} \left\{ \bar{\psi} (i\gamma^\mu \nabla_\mu + e\gamma^\mu A_\mu + M) \psi - \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \right\}.$$

The one-loop effective action (EA) in the metric and electromagnetic sectors can be defined via the path integral

$$e^{i\Gamma[g_{\mu\nu}, A_\mu]} = \int D\psi D\bar{\psi} e^{iS}. \quad (2)$$

In the conventional form we find (see, e.g., [9])

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Gamma}^{(1)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Ln Det } \hat{H}, \\ \hat{H} &= i(\gamma^\mu \nabla_\mu - ie\gamma^\mu A_\mu - iM). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In order to use the heat kernel method, one has to multiply $\hat{H}$ by a conjugate operator $\hat{H}^*$, such that the product has the form $\hat{H}\hat{H}^* = \hat{\square} + 2\hat{h}^\mu\nabla_\mu + \hat{\Pi}$. The point is that the choice of the conjugate operator $\hat{H}^*$ is not unique. Here we consider the two following choices:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_1^* &= -i\gamma^\mu\nabla_\mu + M - e\gamma^\nu A_\nu \quad \text{and} \\ \hat{H}_2^* &= -i\gamma^\mu\nabla_\mu + M.\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

In what follows the difference between the $\hat{H}_1^*$ and $\hat{H}_2^*$ cases will be named “scheme dependence”. The question is whether the $F^{\mu\nu}(\dots)F_{\mu\nu}$ -type terms calculated via the expressions $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}\hat{H}_1^*$ and $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}\hat{H}_2^*$ are the same or not. In both cases we assume

$$\text{Ln Det } \hat{H} = \text{Ln Det } (\hat{H}\hat{H}^*) - \text{Ln Det } \hat{H}^*.\tag{5}$$

Now, in the first case the contributions of $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}$ and $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}_1^*$ are equal [10], so in fact we can take

$$\text{Ln Det } \hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Ln Det } (\hat{H}\hat{H}_1^*).$$

In the second case the expression $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}_2^*$ does not depend on A_μ and therefore the $F^{\mu\nu}(\dots)F_{\mu\nu}$ -type terms satisfy (using obvious notations) the relation

$$\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}\Big|_{FF} = \text{Ln Det } (\hat{H}\hat{H}_2^*)\Big|_{FF}.$$

So, if the first identity from (1) holds, we are going to meet the two equal expressions,

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{Ln Det } (\hat{H}\hat{H}_1^*)\Big|_{FF} = \text{Ln Det } (\hat{H}\hat{H}_2^*)\Big|_{FF},\tag{6}$$

but if (6) does not hold, (1) is violated. We will show that in fact the two expressions have different finite parts despite the divergent parts being equal. Moreover in the case of $\hat{H}_2^*$ the gauge invariance is violated in the finite part of EA. Let us note that the last occurrence can be seen as one more confirmation of the MA. The reason is that the expression $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}$ is gauge invariant by construction (we assume invariant regularization) and the expression $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}_2^*$ does not depend on the gauge field A_μ and hence it is also gauge invariant. Hence, if $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}\hat{H}_2^*$ is non-invariant, then

$$\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}\hat{H}_2^* \neq \text{Ln Det } \hat{H} + \text{Ln Det } \hat{H}_2^*$$

and we meet one more evidence of the MA.

Let us see whether the situation described above really takes place. In order to calculate $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}\hat{H}_1^*$ and $\text{Ln Det } \hat{H}\hat{H}_2^*$ we use the heat kernel solution [11] which was earlier applied to the derivation of formfactors in the gravitational sector [12, 13]. Let us note also that the same result can be achieved via the Feynman diagrams [12].

The one-loop quantum correction for the $\hat{H}_1^*$ case has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Gamma}^{(1)} \Big|_{FF} &= -\frac{e^2}{2(4\pi)^2} \int d^4x \sqrt{g} F_{\mu\nu} \left[\frac{2}{3\epsilon} + k_1^{FF}(a) \right] F^{\mu\nu}, \\ \text{with} \quad k_1^{FF}(a) &= Y \left(2 - \frac{8}{3a^2} \right) - \frac{2}{9}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where we used the following notations:

$$Y = 1 - \frac{1}{a} \ln \left(\frac{2+a}{2-a} \right), \quad a^2 = \frac{4\Box}{\Box - 4m^2}.$$

For the $\hat{H}_2^*$ case we meet a different result, namely (we do not use the notation $\Big|_{FF}$ here because there are other $\mathcal{O}(A^2)$ -terms)

$$\bar{\Gamma}^{(1)} \Big|_{AA} = -\frac{e^2}{2(4\pi)^2} \int d^4x \sqrt{g} \left\{ F_{\mu\nu} \left[\frac{2}{3\epsilon} + k_2^{FF}(a) \right] F^{\mu\nu} \right. \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \nabla_\mu A^\mu \left[Y \left(\frac{8}{3a^2} - 2 \right) + \frac{2}{9} \right] \nabla_\nu A^\nu \\ &+ R_{\mu\nu} \left[\frac{8Y}{3a^2} + \frac{2}{9} \right] A^\nu A^\mu + A^\nu A^\mu \left[\frac{8Y}{3a^2} + \frac{2}{9} \right] R_{\mu\nu} \\ &+ \nabla_\mu A^\nu \left[\frac{16Y}{3a^2} + \frac{4}{9} \right] \nabla_\nu A^\mu + \mathcal{O}(R \cdot A \cdot A) \Big\}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{where} \quad k_2^{FF}(a) = Y \left(1 + \frac{4}{3a^2} \right) + \frac{1}{9},$$

and $\mathcal{O}(R \cdot A \cdot A)$ are terms proportional to scalar curvature.

In the expressions (7) and (9), ϵ is the parameter of dimensional regularization

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} = \frac{2}{4-d} + \ln \left(\frac{4\pi\mu^2}{m^2} \right) - \gamma, \quad \gamma = 0.5772 \dots$$

It is easy to see that the divergences are exactly the same in the two expressions but, at the same time, the finite parts indicate the presence of MA. In fact, the situation is exactly as it was described above. In the divergent parts of the two formulas (7) and (9) there is no scheme dependence, while the finite nonlocal parts of these expressions do differ and, also, (9) is not gauge invariant. The scheme dependence can not be eliminated by adjusting the renormalization condition, because the last does not concern the nonlocal part of EA. So, we have confirmed the existence of MA for the Dirac operator. However, in this situation the interested reader has the right to ask natural questions like: “Is it all correct?” and “Why does the MA take place?” Of course, the first question can be addressed only through a clear answer to the second one, and we will present such an answer in the next section.

3 $\hat{a}_n$ coefficients and the origin of MA

In order to understand the origin of the MA, let us remember that the heat kernel solution of [11] is a sum of the series of the coincidence limits of the Schwinger-DeWitt coefficients $a_n(x, x')$. The equal divergences of the two effective actions (7) and (9) mean that the coefficients a_2 of

the two operators do coincide in the four-dimensional space. The distinct finite parts mean that some other coefficients are in fact different. Therefore the natural way to check the correctness of the results (7) and (9) is to calculate the coincidence limit of some other coefficient, e.g., $a_1(x, x')$, or $a_3(x, x')$. Before we begin our calculations, let us imagine what should we expect as a possible output. For this end it is most interesting to consider an arbitrary dimension d of space-time. The $4d$ case considered above has shown that the divergent part of the effective action is scheme-independent and thus universal. Mathematically, there is nothing special about $4d$, so we can expect that this universality holds also in other even dimensions.

Let us note that the expression $\hat{a}_k = \text{Tr} \lim_{x' \rightarrow x} a_k(x, x')$ with $k = 1$ corresponds to the UV divergence of EA in $2d$, with $k = 2$ in $4d$, with $k = 3$ in $6d$ etc. Therefore the universality of the UV divergences implies that $\hat{a}_1$ is universal in $2d$, $\hat{a}_2$ in $4d$, $\hat{a}_3$ in $6d$ etc. The most interesting moment in this story is that the universality of the Schwinger-DeWitt coefficients in the “right” dimensions automatically implies the non-universality of the overall finite contributions in *any* particular dimension! The point is that the general expression for the coincidence limit $\lim_{x' \rightarrow x} a_k(x, x')$ does not depend on d , but the corresponding functional trace $\hat{a}_k$ does. As a result, if the two traces are equal in the “right” dimensions, they are unlikely to be equal in other dimensions. For instance, all terms except $\hat{a}_2$ are scheme-dependent in $4d$, and therefore the sum of the series made out of these terms is also not universal. Indeed, this is exactly what we observe in the formfactors (7) and (9) calculated within the two distinct schemes.

Let us verify that the considerations presented above are correct. We start from the evaluation of $\hat{a}_1$ in $2d$. We know that the $\hat{a}_1 = \int \sqrt{g} \hat{P}$, where $\hat{P}$'s in the two cases are given by the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}_1 &= -\frac{1}{12} R + M^2 - \frac{ie}{2} \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu F_{\mu\nu}, \\ \hat{P}_2 &= -\frac{1}{12} R - \frac{ie}{4} \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu F_{\mu\nu} + M^2 + eM \gamma^\mu A_\mu \\ &\quad + \frac{ie}{2} (\nabla^\mu A_\mu) - \frac{(d-2)}{4} e^2 A^\nu A_\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

It is easy to see that the difference between the two traces is reduced to the total derivative in $2d$, while in other dimensions it is more significant. Furthermore, only in $2d$ the $\text{Tr} \hat{P}_2$ is a gauge invariant expression. Let us note that the difference in total derivative may indicate some real thing for the finite part of EA, but not for renormalization. Therefore the general expectation described above is completely confirmed in the $\hat{a}_1$ case. We leave it as an exercise to the reader to check that the situation is the same for the $\hat{a}_2$ coefficients, where the two schemes give equal results in the $4d$ case and distinct results for $d \neq 4$ cases.

As a last test, let us now consider the $\hat{a}_3$ coefficient. Within the first calculational scheme with $\hat{H}_1^*$ of (4), we just confirm the known result of Ref. [14],

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{a}_3^{(1)} \Big|_{AA} &= \frac{de^2}{360} (2 R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F^{\mu\nu} F^{\alpha\beta} - 26 R_\nu^\alpha F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\alpha} \\ &\quad + 24 \nabla_\nu F^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\alpha F_\mu{}^\alpha + 5 R F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The expression $\hat{a}_3^{(2)}$ for the second scheme, with $\hat{H}_2^*$, is rather bulky [here $(\nabla A) = (\nabla_\mu A^\mu)$]:

$$\hat{a}_3^{(2)} \Big|_{AA} = \frac{de^2}{2880} \left\{ 120 (\nabla A) \square (\nabla A) - 60 F_{\mu\nu} \square F^{\mu\nu} \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - 24\nabla_\nu F^{\mu\nu} \nabla^\alpha F_{\mu\alpha} + 24(\square A^\alpha)[(d-3)(\square A_\alpha) + 2\nabla_\alpha(\nabla A)] \\
& - 24(\nabla_\alpha \nabla_\mu A_\beta) \left[(\nabla^\beta \nabla^\mu A^\alpha) - (\nabla^\alpha \nabla^\mu A^\beta) \right] \\
& + A^\mu A_\mu \left[(18-7d)R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^2 - 8(9-d)R_{\mu\nu}^2 - 6(5-d)R^2 \right] \\
& + 8R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \left[4(\nabla^\alpha A^\nu)(\nabla^\mu A^\beta) - 8F^{\mu\nu} F^{\alpha\beta} - 3(d-4)(\nabla^\mu A^\alpha)(\nabla^\nu A^\beta) \right. \\
& - R^{\lambda\nu\alpha\beta} A^\mu A_\lambda + 10R^{\mu\beta} A^\alpha A^\nu \left. \right] \\
& + 16R_{\mu\nu} \left[10(\nabla A)(\nabla^\mu A^\nu) + (\nabla^\alpha A^\mu)(5\nabla_\alpha A^\nu - 2\nabla^\nu A_\alpha) \right. \\
& - (d-5)(\nabla^\mu A^\alpha)(\nabla^\nu A_\alpha) - 2R^\mu{}_\alpha A^\alpha A^\nu \left. \right] \\
& + 10R \left[2(d-5)(\nabla_\mu A_\nu)(\nabla^\mu A^\nu) - 2(\nabla A)^2 + 3F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + 2R_{\mu\nu} A^\mu A^\nu \right] \\
& - 12(d-2)A^\alpha A_\alpha \square R \\
& - 48(\nabla^\alpha R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta})(\nabla^\nu A^\beta A^\mu) - 24(\nabla^\nu R)[(\nabla_\nu A^\alpha A_\alpha) - (\nabla_\alpha A^\alpha A_\nu)] \left. \right\}. \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that, in $4d$, the formulas (11) and (12) do coincide with the third orders of the expansions of the complete expressions (7) and (9), correspondingly. This correspondence serves as an independent verification for the correctness of our formfactors (7) and (9).

The comparison of the expressions (11) and (12) shows that, in the flat space limit, the $\hat{a}_3^{(2)}$ does coincide with $\hat{a}_3^{(1)}$ in $6d$ and only in $6d$. Furthermore, we could prove that the terms porportional to $R F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$ in two expressions $\hat{a}_3^{(2)}$ and $\hat{a}_3^{(1)}$ coincide (up to total derivatives) on dS/AdS background. In any other dimension the gauge invariance is broken even in the flat space background, as it was expected from general arguments given above. The difference between $\hat{a}_3^{(2)}$ and $\hat{a}_3^{(1)}$ is precisely the one which can be observed between the first terms of expansion of the general expressions (7) and (9). At that point we can say that our general arguments concerning the origin of the MA is very well supported by direct calculations of the first three Schwinger-DeWitt coefficients.

4 Appelquist and Carazzone theorem

Let us look at the UV and IR limits of the physical β -functions for the charge e . Starting from the expressions (7) and (9), correspondingly, we arrive at the following expressions for the β -functions:

$$\beta_e^1 = \frac{e^3 [48 - 20a^2 + 3(a^2 - 4)^2(1 - Y)]}{6a^2(4\pi)^2}, \quad (13)$$

versus

$$\beta_e^2 = \frac{e^3 [3(a^4 - 16) - 4a^2(12 + a^2)(1 - Y)]}{12a^3(4\pi)^2}. \quad (14)$$

In the high energy limit, when $p^2 \gg m^2$, $a \rightarrow 2$ and the two expressions give identical results, which also coincides with the one from the minimal subtraction scheme (up to a small correction),

$$\beta_e^{UV} = \frac{4e^3}{3(4\pi)^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^2}{p^2}\right), \quad (15)$$

However, at the low-energy end the results are different, namely

$$\beta_e^{1IR} = \frac{e^3}{(4\pi)^2} \cdot \frac{4M^2}{15m^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M^4}{m^4}\right) \quad (16)$$

for the first scheme $\hat{H}_1^*$, and

$$\beta_e^{2IR} = \frac{e^3}{(4\pi)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{5} \frac{M^2}{m^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M^4}{m^4}\right) \quad (17)$$

for the second one, with $\hat{H}_2^*$. Thus we met a scheme ambiguity, also, in the decoupling theorem [15].

In order to better understand the sense of the MA and the above difference in the β -functions, we can look at the lowest order term in the EA, where the difference shows up,

$$\frac{1}{30} \cdot \int d^4x \sqrt{g} F^{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{\square}{m^2} \right) F_{\mu\nu} \quad (18)$$

In the flat space-time, one can easily use integrations by parts to show that this term is proportional to the Maxwell equations, $(\nabla_\mu F^{\mu\nu})^2$. Hence this term will not influence the equations of motion in flat space in the $\mathcal{O}(e^2)$ approximation [14]. However, the situation gets changed when we deal with the curved space. In this case we meet a difference that is proportional to curvatures, due to the relation

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\mu\nu} \square F^{\mu\nu} &= -2\nabla_\nu F^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\lambda F_\mu{}^\lambda + 2R_{\lambda\nu} F^{\mu\nu} F_\mu{}^\lambda \\ &- R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} F^{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

It is important that this difference is also confirmed by the derivation of the $\hat{a}_3$ coefficient described in the previous section.

5 Conclusions

We have calculated the formfactor in the electromagnetic sector of QED in curved space-time and found that this quantum correction depends on the choice of the calculational scheme (4). Thus we have proven the existence of the nonlocal and renormalization independent MA in quantum field theory. One of the consequences of this anomaly is the ambiguity in the prediction of the decoupling theorem [15], which provides two different coefficients of the quadratic decoupling law at low energies.

The MA in the electromagnetic formfactor means that the off-shell EA possesses some new important ambiguity. One can use the Maxwell equation and show that in the flat space the ambiguous terms disappear on shell. However, this does not happen in curved space where we meet a real ambiguity proportional to the RFF -terms.

How should we interpret the existence of MA? In fact, the EA is always ambiguous to some extent. For instance, there is a strong dependence on the choice of parametrization for the quantum field [16] which becomes relevant beyond the leading-log approximation. Perhaps, from the practical viewpoint the best option is to follow the most natural approach and, for instance, take the most natural parametrization of quantum fields and the most natural and symmetry preserving scheme of calculation. On the other hand, it is always good to be aware on the real features of the utilized formalism, and from this perspective it is indeed important to know that the MA is a real thing.

Acknowledgments

Authors are grateful to CNPq, FAPEMIG, FAPES and ICTP (I.Sh.) for support.

References

- [1] M. Kontsevich and S. Vishik, *Geometry of determinants of elliptic operators*, hep-th/9406140; In Functional Analysis on the Eve of the 21st Century, Progress in Math. 131, Birkhuser Verlag, 1995;
Determinants of elliptic pseudodifferential operators, hep-th/9404046.
- [2] E. Elizalde, L. Vanzo and S. Zerbini, Commun. Math. Phys. **194** (1998) 613;
G. Cognola, E. Elizalde and S. Zerbini, Commun. Math. Phys. **237** (2003) 507, hep-th/9910038;
E. Elizalde, G. Cognola and S. Zerbini, Nucl. Phys. B532 (1998) 407;
E. Elizalde and M. Tierz, J. Math. Phys. **45** (2004) 1168, hep-th/0402186.
- [3] T.S. Evans, Phys. Lett. **B457** (1999) 127;
- [4] J.S. Dowker, *On the relevance of the multiplicative anomaly*, hep-th/9803200;
- [5] J.J. McKenzie-Smith and D.J. Toms, Phys. Rev. D58 (1998) 105001.
- [6] E. Elizalde, *Zeta regularization techniques with applications*, (World Scientific, 1994).
- [7] I.L. Shapiro and G. Cognola, Class. Quant. Grav. **15** (1998) 787.
- [8] B. Gonçalves, G. de Berredo-Peixoto and I.L. Shapiro, *One-loop corrections to the photon propagator in the curved-space QED*. Paper in preparation.
- [9] I.L. Buchbinder, S.D. Odintsov and I.L. Shapiro, *Effective Action in Quantum Gravity*, IOP Publishing, Bristol, 1992.
- [10] G. De Berredo-Peixoto, Mod. Phys. Lett. A16 (2001) 2463.
- [11] A.O. Barvinsky and G.A. Vilkovisky, Nucl. Phys. **333B** (1990) 471;
I. G. Avramidi, Yad. Fiz. (Sov. Journ. Nucl. Phys.) **49** (1989) 1185.

- [12] E.V. Gorbar and I.L. Shapiro, JHEP **02** (2003) 021;
- [13] E.V. Gorbar and I.L. Shapiro, JHEP **06** (2003) 004.
- [14] I.T. Drummond and S.J. Hathrell, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 343.
- [15] T. Appelquist and J. Carazzone, Phys. Rev. 11D (1975) 2856.
- [16] I.V. Tyutin, Yad. Fiz. (Physics of Atomic Nuclei) 35 (1982) 222 (in Russian).